

OCT 14 1926

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at  
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of  
March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on  
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XX, No. 1

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1926

WHOLE No. 531

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

## *Attractive Latin Readers*

*for supplementary use*

CAESAR'S HELVETIAN WAR	- - - -	Welch and Duffield
CAESAR'S INVASION OF BRITAIN	- -	Welch and Duffield
JULIA: A LATIN READING BOOK	- - - - -	Reed
CAMILLA	- - - - -	Reed
ORA MARITIMA	- - - - -	Sonnenschein
LEGENDS OF GODS AND HEROES	- - - - -	Morton
LIVY'S LEGENDS OF ANCIENT ROME	- - -	Wilkinson
LIVY'S THE SEVEN KINGS OF ROME	- - - - -	Nall

### ELEMENTARY LATIN CLASSICS

A series of handy readers that offer simple, well-graded reading for beginning work. The volumes, measuring  $4\frac{1}{2}$ " x  $6\frac{1}{4}$ ", are bound in durable blue cloth. They are all well edited with notes and vocabularies.

EACH 48 CENTS

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York

Boston

Chicago

Dallas

Atlanta

San Francisco

*Announcing a New Textbook Series for Colleges*

## THE CENTURY COLLEGE LATIN SERIES

*Edited by*

MARBURY B. OGLE, Ph.D.

*Professor of Classical Languages at the  
Ohio State University*

### Introducing the Series

This Series, of which **ENGLISH AND LATIN** is a member, is being prepared for the special use of undergraduate students in Latin.

Each volume will be edited or written by a scholar whose field of research particularly well qualifies him to deal authoritatively with the subject assigned to him.

Each text will be introduced by a short account of the manuscript tradition, a brief discussion of the historical and literary significance of the work, and a sketch of the author. The text will be supplemented by notes aimed to supply such linguistic, grammatical and syntactical explanations as are necessary for a proper understanding and intelligent interpretation of the work, and adequate indexes and selected bibliographies will be additional features of each volume.

Among the volumes in preparation for this Series are

**Livy, Books XXX-XXXIII.** Edited by Clarence W. Mendell, Ph.D., Yale University.

**Selections from the Philosophical Works of Cicero.** Edited by Nelson G. McCrea, Ph.D., Columbia University.

**Plautus' Mostellaria.** Edited by Henry W. Prescott, Ph.D., University of Chicago.

**Ovid's Metamorphoses.** Edited by Edward K. Rand, Ph.D., Harvard University.

**Anglo-Latin Literature Before and After the Conquest.** By Frederick Tupper, Ph.D., University of Vermont, and Marbury B. Ogle, Ph.D., Ohio State University.

**Selections from the Elegiac Poets.** Edited by Arthur L. Wheeler, Ph.D., Princeton University.

### Introducing the First Volume

#### **ENGLISH AND LATIN**

By MARBURY B. OGLE, Ph.D., Professor of Classical Languages at the Ohio State University; with the co-operation of LESTER M. PRINDLE, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Latin at the University of Vermont.

This manual offers for translation into Latin material which illustrates difficult sentence structure and the more important principles of Latin grammar. The aim of the book is to awaken the student of Latin to a curiosity about language as language and to challenge him to think more carefully about the character of Latin and of his own English by bringing the differences between the two languages into high relief. The sentences chosen for translation are from standard English and are such as the students themselves use in ordinary conversation.

Instead of following the traditional practice of giving references to standard Grammars, this book presents a careful explanation of each important grammatical principle and illustrates the principle by numerous typical examples. The prose offered for translation into Latin serves to illustrate further the principles. The introductory chapter attempts to give some idea of the nature of the Latin language and to show why the Latins talked as they did and how their speech differs from our English as an implement for the expression of thought.

This is a logically arranged and practical manual of prose composition that should awaken the student's interest in Latin as an implement for the expression of thought.

§§Professors and instructors who are interested in this Series are cordially invited to write to The Century Co., 353 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y., or 2126 Prairie Avenue, Chicago, Ill., for further information. **ENGLISH AND LATIN** is expected from the press about October 1. It will be an 8vo book of about 190 pages.

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XX, No. 1

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1926

WHOLE NO. 531

## MEDIEVAL LATIN NOT FOR BEGINNERS IN LATIN

In the New York Times, January 18, 1925, there was an editorial entitled Teaching Latin. This was inspired by a recent event—a Conference of Headmasters of the English Public Schools, at which “there was renewal of the endless debate about the teaching of Latin”. The writer of the editorial was evidently an ardent admirer of Dr. W. H. D. Rouse, of the Perse School, Cambridge, and of the Direct Method of teaching Latin, so energetically advocated for many years past by Dr. Rouse, and exemplified by him at Teachers College, in the summer of 1912 (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.42-45). For three quarters of a column or more, the writer of the editorial makes merry at the expense of all those who decline to adapt themselves enthusiastically to Dr. Rouse’s method.

I turn aside, for a moment, to call attention to a rather important matter. In *Classical Philology* 19. 294-295 (July, 1924), Professor B. L. Ullman published a review of a book by Eduard Hermann, *Die Sprachwissenschaft in der Schule* (for a review of the book by Professor E. H. Sturtevant see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 18.55). In Professor Ullman’s review occurred the following brief paragraph: “The Direct Method of teaching is pronounced <by Professor Hermann> practically dead in Germany as far as the modern languages are concerned. It is not even mentioned for the ancient”. But, of course, the editorial writer in the New York Times knew nothing of this.

The editorial writer, having made merry about a subject concerning which, evidently, he knew nothing, concluded as follows:

...What is the good of Latin unless you enjoy it? How much “general literary and historical training” do our boy Latinists get out of Cicero’s shrewish piffle and braggadocio? An old gentleman said to us over his cup of coffee the other day: “I don’t remember a thing about it except that I always loved Catiline; and I hate that old windbag, Cicero, still”. Be that as it may, Latin can always be learned, even if it is seldom taught to be other than a bore. There are all sorts of Latin. Buy a Roman Breviary! Buy the “Confessions” of St. Augustine, which Mr. Loeb has kindly had translated. If you want a more familiar kind of Latin, try “*Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*” or Walter Map’s “*De Nugis Curialium*”, which two American scholars have lately translated. There is no end of Latin, and it isn’t hard to find plenty of medieval or modern make much more interesting than most of the preserved classical brand.

I should like the chance to test the writer of this paragraph by examining him in ‘sight reading’ of passages selected at random from the authors and the works he names.

It seems to me about time that someone took the

trouble to combat the suggestion made all too frequently that medieval Latin forms the best means of approach to the study of Latin.

Dr. Max Radin, who formerly taught Latin in a New York City High School, but is now Professor of Law at the University of California, argued in support of this position in an article entitled *Medieval Latin Literature* (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 17.179-181). After some very interesting and sane remarks upon the value of medieval Latin literature, Professor Radin proceeded to maintain (181) that we ought to introduce our students to Latin by way of medieval Latin literature. As things go at present, he said, our pupils in the High Schools fail to master Latin because of “the enormous complexity of a highly artificial technique of style, such as Cicero possesses, and of the literally vast historical information necessary to grasp fully the bearing of most of what he has to tell us...” Professor Radin proceeded thus:

In medieval Latin, stylistic difficulties are at a minimum, and in most cases, the substance is much nearer the things modern people habitually read about and think about. We may therefore assume that the energy released will enable pages to be read where lines were formerly read. And, if we can multiply by ten or twenty times the amount of reading actually done, we shall have, I think, acquired that reflex which seems to be necessary for reading as for any other art.

It will doubtless be retorted that a year spent with Matthew Paris is less likely to be spiritually valuable than a year spent with Cicero. That is true. But a pupil can learn to read Matthew Paris much more readily than he can learn to read Cicero. And, if he learns to read the medieval chronicler first, he can learn to read the ancient humanist very quickly. Under present conditions, he often learns to read neither—even if he passes a brilliant examination in Intermediate Latin.

And the road he will have travelled will have had its amenities. To read the Hymns, the Carmina Burana, to know John of Salisbury and the letters of Heloise is to have obtained an acquaintance with an important literature, the image of a colorful and active society, which has an independent claim on the world’s attention.

Now, as a matter of fact, I have for several years been conducting at Columbia University a course in Medieval Latin which ranks as a graduate course. I am sure that of the graduate students in Classics and in history who have taken that course none has found Matthew of Paris or William of Newburgh or the *Itinerarium Regis Ricardi* easy to master. Yet Professor Radin seems to believe that even beginners in Latin can find such works easy to master. Stylistic difficulties in Matthew of Paris and William of Newburgh are not at a minimum. Again, those authors are made far more difficult than they would otherwise be, by the fact that the only accessible editions of them are punctuated without any regard, in many cases, to

sense. Furthermore, I do not mind confessing that I myself found it difficult at times to understand Matthew of Paris or William of Newburgh or the *Itinerarium Regis Ricardi*, just because I lack the background of information necessary for the understanding of this, that, or the other passage. The truth of the matter is that nobody can read—easily, quickly, and intelligently—anything except A B C stuff unless he possesses a knowledge, in many cases, "literally vast". To understand medieval Latin one ought to know, for instance, the Vulgate Bible practically by heart. He ought to know also a very great deal about the Church—its organization, its history, its technical terms. He ought to know a good deal also about contemporary European history—I mean European history contemporary with William of Newburgh, or with Matthew of Paris. This is no easy thing to master. Geographical matters that one ought to understand, in order to appreciate William of Newburgh or Matthew of Paris, are not one jot or tittle less complicated than the geographical matters one has to understand in order to read intelligently and appreciatively Cicero and Vergil; in fact, I personally think that they are more difficult than the geographical matters one needs to know in order to understand the standard ancient authors of the Normal High School Latin course. For example, does everyone know that in certain Latin works Babylon = Egypt?

But better than generalities are concrete examples.

In 1924, Professors Charles Upson Clark and Josiah Bethea Game brought out, as their "contribution to the solution of the problems connected with the study of second year Latin" (Preface, vii) a book entitled *Second Latin: Easy Selections from Medieval and Renaissance Latin for Use of Pupils who have Completed the First Year in Latin* (Chicago: Mentzner, Bush and Co. Pp. x + 136). The second selection in this book (page 1) is entitled *A Test of Friendship*, and is taken from Petrus Alfonsus, *Disciplina Clericalis*, Exemplum I. It runs as follows:

Arabs moriturus, vocato filio suo, dixit: "Dic, fili, quot tibi acquisiveris amicos". Respondens, filius dixit: "Centum, ut arbitror, mihi acquisivi amicos". Dixit pater: "Philosophus dicit: 'ne laudes amicum donec probaveris eum'. Ego quidem prior natus sum, et unius dimidietatem vix mihi acquisivi. Tu ergo centum quo modo tibi acquisisti? Vade, igitur, et probes omnes, ut cognoscas si quis omnium tibi perfectus sit amicus".

Will all students who are beginning second year Latin view this passage with unalloyed joy?

I have repeatedly heard the declaration that the Vulgate, for instance, and various parts of medieval Latin literature are easier to read than the classical Latin authors are. Now it happens that, within my experience at least, these declarations have regularly been made by persons who had studied classical Latin, indeed had taught it for a long time. I venture the assertion, with no fear of successful contradiction, that these persons found 'vulgar' Latin and medieval Latin easy—if, indeed, they found them easy at all—just because they had studied classical Latin so long. In other words, I think that Professor Radin, in his

article in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, referred to above, committed a mental hysteron proteron. If he can read Matthew of Paris and William of Newburgh with any ease at all, he reads them with ease, I repeat, because he had previously read and taught classical Latin. I venture the declaration also that the Latin of the Vulgate is easy only to those who have been trained all their lives, in Roman Catholic institutions, in such Latin, or to those who know well an English translation. New Testament Greek, by the way, is said to be easy. If it is, it is because a good many of us were pretty well trained in our day and generation in the English translations of the New Testament.

I transcribe here two passages from the Vulgate, taking in each instance the first passage of the Old Testament and the first of the New on which my eye happens to light (Jeremiah 19.1-6, and Matthew 2.13-18):

Haec dicit Dominus: Vade, et accipe lagunculam figuli testeam a senioribus populi, et a senioribus sacerdotum: Et egredere ad vallem filii Ennom, quae est iuxta introitum portae fictilis: et praedicabis ibi verba, quae ego loquar ad te. Et dices: Audite verbum Domini reges Iuda, et habitatores Ierusalem: haec dicit Dominus exercituum Deus Israel: Ecce ego inducam afflictionem super locum istum, ita ut omnis, qui audierit illam, tinniant aures eius: Eo quod dereliquerint me, et alienum fecerint locum istum: et libaverunt in eo diis alienis, quos nescierunt ipsi, et patres eorum, et reges Iuda: et repleverunt locum istum sanguine innocentum. Et aedificaverunt excelsa Baalim ad comburendos filios suos igni in holocaustum Baalim: quae non praecepi, nec locutus sum, nec ascenderunt in cor meum. Propterea ecce dies veniunt, dicit Dominus: et non vocabitur amplius locus iste, Topheth, et Vallis filii Ennom: sed Vallis occisionis.

Qui cum recessissent, ecce angelus Domini apparuit in somnis Ioseph, dicens: Surge, et accipe puerum, et matrem eius, et fuge in Aegyptum, et esto ibi usque dum dicam tibi. Futurum est enim ut Herodes quaerat puerum ad perdendum eum.

Qui consurgens accepit puerum, et matrem eius nocte, et secessit in Aegyptum: et erat ibi usque ad obitum Herodis: ut adimpleretur quod dictum est a Domino per Prophetam dicentem: Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum.

Tunc Herodes videns quoniam illus esset a Magis, iratus est valde, et mittens occidit omnes pueros, qui erant in Bethlehem, et in omnibus finibus eius a bimatu et infra secundum tempus, quod exquisierat a Magis. Tunc adimpletum est quod dictum est per Ieremiam prophetam dicentem:

Vox in Rama audita est ploratus, et ululatus multus: Rachel plorans filios suos, et noluit consolari, quia non sunt.

In the Vulgate the famous Twenty-third Psalm runs as follows:

Dominus regit me, et nihil mihi deerit: in loco pascuae ibi me collocavit. Super aquam refectionis educavit me: animam meam convertit. Deduxit me super semitas iustitiae, propter nomen suum. Nam, et si ambulavero in medio umbrae mortis, non timebo mala: quoniam tu mecum es. Virga tua, et baculus tuus: ipsa me consolata sunt. Parasti in conspectu meo mensam, adversus eos, qui tribulant me. Inpinguasti in oleo caput meum: et calix meus inebrians quam praeclarus est! Et misericordia tua subsequetur me omnibus diebus vitae meae: Et ut inhabitem in domo Domini, in longitudinem dierum.



Will this Psalm make an easy introduction into Latin for a first year Latin student? Will it be easy for a second year Latin student? Or for a third year Latin student? Will the queer capitalization and punctuation add to the ease of interpretation? Will even the advanced scholar find it easy to interpret some of the expressions? Will any one find it easy to fit the familiar English version to the Latin?

(To be concluded)

CHARLES KNAPP

### THE GREEK EXPLOITATION OF EGYPT<sup>1</sup>

A modern student who attempts to understand the economic life of the ancient Greeks and Romans is handicapped in two particular ways. Immediately he is confronted by the fact that up to the present it has been impossible to write an adequate consecutive history of ancient economics. Many intensive and difficult detailed investigations of special subjects and places must be made, especially in the field of archaeology, before such an economic history can be attempted with any hope of success. Lacking the comprehensive knowledge which could be obtained from such a trustworthy survey, the modern scholar carries with him into the study of antiquity the economic preconceptions of his own day, of which he can divest himself only with the greatest effort. Unless he is constantly on his guard his figures will fit themselves into this background. Then the result will be that his ancient people and ancient life will be exaggeratedly modern, and untrue to themselves. If, on the other hand, the present-day scholar is too conscious of his own economic modernity, his actors and their actions tend to appear as detached from any economic background, or as bizarre figures which react much too primitively to the stimuli of historic life, their doings unmotivated by the fundamental economic necessities which assuredly influenced them.

The second difficulty arises out of the 'classical' training in the Greek and the Latin languages and literatures which is the essential equipment of any man who ventures into the field of ancient economic research to-day. In its better forms this training is excellent as an induction into the methods of a critical approach to historical sources. It tends, however, to be highly subjective and even idealistic, so much so that one is justified in speaking of a 'classicistic attitude' toward ancient culture. The ancient historian must, therefore, marshal to his aid a degree of sane realism, which is equally necessary and more easily maintained in other fields of historical investigation. Alma-Tadema's painting, *A Reading from Homer*, which hangs in reproductions upon the walls of so many of our Secondary Schools, is aesthetically and in point

of composition a rather notable work of art. It is also a drastic example of the worst form of classicism. As a symbol of the culture of the ancient Greeks, it is sentimentally idealistic, inept, misleading, and even dangerous. The ancient Hellenes had little enough time to lie prone beside the wine-colored sea, with chins propped on their hands, listening raptly to readings from Homer. One knows their life and their appreciation of Homer much better by a simple reading of the *Ion* of Plato, and by allowing, even there, for a certain amount of idealization. Crassly stated, the painting of Alma-Tadema would be an equally applicable symbol of the productive energy of the ancient Hellenes if the roll from which the rhapsodist is reading were a business document, and if the subject of rapt attention were the possibility of a profit of twenty-five per cent a year, instead of the deep-sounding harmonies of Homeric hexameter.

The study here presented arose partly as a corrective to what may be called 'hyperbolic classicism'. More particularly it was suggested by the obvious consideration that the conquest of Western Asia and Egypt by Alexander was followed by an intensive economic penetration and exploitation of this great area by Greeks and Macedonians, and that the thoroughness of that exploitation is only to be explained by definite advantages and superiorities of the conquering people which surpassed the bounds of mere military efficiency. The problem was therefore clearly set, namely, to determine, if possible, what advantages lay with the Hellenes of the fourth and the third pre-Christian centuries over their non-Hellenic contemporaries which enabled them to dominate so completely the economic and political world of that day and sphere.

Expansive energy was one of the most notable characteristics of the Greek people throughout the first pre-Christian millennium, just as it is to-day. The details of their earliest voyages of discovery into the Black Sea and westward to Italy and Sicily appear to us only in mythological form. In the wake of exploring adventurers came those Greeks who colonized all the northern stretches of the Mediterranean littoral. The causes of early Greek colonization will probably always remain conjectural. The facts and the results upon the ancient world are entirely historical. In his recent brilliant article upon 'Alexander and Hellenistic Economic Life' Ulrich Wilcken has depicted Alexander the Great as one of the great historic explorers of the world<sup>2</sup>. In this sense Alexander was a typical Greek, however sincerely Demosthenes may have denounced his father, Philip, as un-Hellenic, a barbarian. Alexander accompanied his conquests with intensive colonization which was assuredly economic as well as military in its purpose, and quite consciously economic in Alexander's mind<sup>3</sup>.

The first period of Greek colonization was followed by an intensive exploitation of the commercial opportunities afforded by the opening-up of new lands to

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read at the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Swarthmore College, May 1-2, 1925. By arrangement with the author and with the editors of the *Political Science Quarterly*, it was published first in the latter periodical, 40:517-530 (December, 1925), virtually as it was presented to the Association. It is reprinted here with such changes only as are necessary to bring it into harmony with the style-sheet of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*. C. K. >

<sup>2</sup>Julius Beloch, *Geschichte Griechenlands*, I, 1, 229-230.

<sup>3</sup>Alexander der Grosse und die Hellenistische Wirtschaft, in *Schmoller's Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung* 45 (1921), 357.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, 355.

Greek energies. The hundred years stretching from the advent of Pericles as leader of Athenian politics to the accession of Philip II as King of Macedon are filled with bloody strife among the Greek city-states, accompanied by great losses in economic goods throughout the area of Hellenic control. Even these losses did not break the general economic prosperity of the Greek world. The trade with Lower Russia in Greek *objets d'art* in gold and silver remained unimpaired throughout the fourth century<sup>5</sup>. The Hellenic cities of Sicily and those of Asia Minor were expanding commercially. Only in Italy were the Greek cities declining in the face of the growing political power and economic advance of the native Italians<sup>6</sup>.

The second period of Greek colonization, begun by Alexander, extended over a period of some sixty years. The Greek commercial exploitation which accompanied it and followed it differed from that of the Hellenic period subsequent to the colonization of the Black Sea and the Northern shore of the Mediterranean. In the earlier period, in so far as imperialism is to be found among the Hellenes, it had confined itself in the main to attempts on the part of the city-states to widen their dominion so as to include other Greek city-states of the same *ethnos*<sup>7</sup>, or, at the most, more distant kin of the same Greek stock. Their exploitation of non-Hellenes had been commercial only, unaccompanied by the necessity of political domination. Within the area of inter-Hellenic city-state strife the struggle for commercial advantage enforced the bitterness already developed by differences of political viewpoint. This new combination of political and commercial causes of war found ruthless expression in Athenian politics in the year 431 B. C. in the total expulsion of the Aeginetans from their native island<sup>8</sup>. If Thucydides was the realist and clear thinker that he is generally supposed to have been, we may assume that, at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, official circles at Athens had wearied of any attempt to conciliate by just treatment the antagonism of the members of the Delian League to the imperialistic hegemony of Athens. The Athenian mission to Sparta in 432 B. C. expressed the conviction that Athens would have then been in a stronger position had it consistently used *force majeure* as its policy in the Delian League. The Athenians had come to the conclusion that compulsory rule, even if based on injustice, was a less galling form of imperialism than exploitation by a State which attempted to preserve the appearance of political equality<sup>9</sup>. Expressed in terms of international politics of the twentieth century, the idea is that States which, theoretically speaking, are

being developed toward democracy under the mandate system will be more troublesome than those ruled under compulsion as dependencies.

Political and territorial imperialism within the circle of the Greek city-states is certainly a characteristic of the fifth and the fourth centuries B. C. The Hellenistic world is distinguished from the preceding period by one fundamental difference. Commercial exploitation had, in the previous period, been based upon the custom of tapping the resources of the Black Sea and Western Mediterranean areas by coastal colonization without actual conquest of the natives. The Macedonian-Greek colonization of Alexander and his successors was inland penetration; and its advantages for exploitation were conditioned upon, and intensified by, Macedonian dynastic control which consciously threw open to Greek business shrewdness and capacity the exploitation of great subjected areas.

If political-territorial imperialism was the basis for tremendous business advantages falling to the Macedonians and the Greeks, the capacity to extract the most out of this favored business situation lay in their great industrial-technical skill and in the superior powers of business organization which they had already developed. From 450 B. C. onward specialization of labor in the manufactories of the Hellenic urban-industrial centers had greatly increased. Here we have the testimony of Xenophon<sup>10</sup>:

'It is impossible for a man who is a jack-of-many-trades to do all things well. In large cities, because of the fact that many persons need each commodity, a single trade suffices for making a living, and often not even one complete trade; but one workman makes men's sandals, another women's. One person makes his living exclusively by stitching sandals, another by cutting them out. One man is exclusively a cutter of *chitons*. Another takes no part in this work, but merely puts the pieces together<sup>11</sup>.

With this superiority in the technique of manufacturing over the more primitive contemporary artisanship of the Persian Empire the Greeks combined a marked superiority in commercial organization. Greek commerce was founded upon and facilitated by a widespread use of coined money. In the Persian Empire the adoption of money coinage and its spread had been slow as compared with the rapidity of its acceptance in the Greek spheres of Mediterranean trade. The coinage of the Great King of Persia was not extensive. The precious metals still lay heaped up in his treasuries, to be coined only as particular necessity required. In the central districts of the Persian Empire and throughout the plateau of Iran the traditional system of barter economy still prevailed. Only on the western periphery of Asia, where Greek enterprise prevailed, or in Lycia, Cilicia, Cyprus, and along the Phoenician and Palestinian coasts, was the use of coined money extensive<sup>12</sup>. Egypt as a Persian province had had no separate coinage of its own before Alexander's advent<sup>13</sup>,

<sup>5</sup>M. Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in Southern Russia*, 69 (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18.34-36).

<sup>6</sup>Beloch, *Geschichte Griechenlands*<sup>3</sup>, III, 1.305, 314-315. For Italy see 307-308. For a different point of view with respect to the economic situation in the fourth century see Eduard Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, 133. Against Meyer's view it may be said that impoverished governments and prosperous industrialists and merchants may go hand in hand. The growth of many individual fortunes, which is commonly reckoned as prosperity, often appears along with a mass increase in misery.

<sup>7</sup>W. S. Ferguson, *Greek Imperialism*, *American Historical Review* 31.763.

<sup>8</sup>Paulys-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 1.967.

<sup>9</sup>Thucydides 1.77.

<sup>10</sup>Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 8.2.5.

<sup>11</sup>See further G. Glotz, *Le Travail dans la Grèce Ancienne*, 265-276 (Paris, 1920).

<sup>12</sup>Eduard Meyer, in Conrad's *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*<sup>4</sup>, 6.828-829. Compare the abbreviated statement in the fourth edition, 6.678.

<sup>13</sup>U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge der Papyrskunde*, lxiii.

except for one issue by a satrap, to whom authority to mint had been delegated by the Great King<sup>14</sup>.

The beginning of private banking as seen at Athens in the fourth century B. C., modest enough, as it actually was, is none the less symptomatic of Greek business capacity as developed under the little city-state form. The Athenian banker Pasion was much more than a mere *trapezites*, a money-changer. His business, however, was not yet a completely specialized banking business, since he was also a manufacturer. But he did receive deposits and he paid interest upon them. He made loans to merchants on sea-trade projects; and payments were made through his bank in mercantile enterprises. Deposits and withdrawals were made only in the presence of witnesses. The only written act in connection with his business was that of keeping the bank accounts of deposits and withdrawals. There was no arrangement of current accounts from which sums could be obtained, except by payment of bar money. There was, of course, no checking system, as is sometimes assumed<sup>15</sup>. Despite its primitive form and its very limited use of accumulated deposits, the bank of Pasion was a departure which augured well for the continuation of Greek business supremacy in the Mediterranean world.

It is also worth noting that in the century preceding Alexander's conquest of the Persian Empire the Hellenes had had experience of the pecuniary advantage to be derived from a monopolistic control by their city-states of the right to sell certain products. Such sale-monopolies, which customarily had to do with the grain supply, were usually dictated by immediate financial need and were only temporary and local in their application<sup>16</sup>. Yet it is clear that Aristotle was thoroughly conscious of the advantage in price-fixing to be derived from the creation of a monopoly. 'Therefore', he says<sup>17</sup>, 'some of the cities make this a practice when they lack money. For they make a monopoly of goods for sale'. Many conditions in the world of the Greek city-states made it impossible for the development of monopolistic control of single commodities in any complete sense of the term. Yet the Greek political writer was conscious of the methods and the results of the sale-monopoly and had invented the technical term for its expression which we still use.

The technique of shipbuilding had advanced in the fourth century throughout the Mediterranean, among the free Greeks as well as among the Greeks, the Syrians, and the Phoenicians subject to Persia<sup>18</sup>. When Alexander conquered Western Asia Minor and the Syrian-Palestinian coast, three of the five great centers of the shipbuilding and shipping industries of the civilized world of that day were under Macedonian-Greek control. In the Western Mediterranean two

centers remained, the one at Carthage, the other among the disunited Greeks of Lower Italy, Sicily, and Lower Gaul. It is a significant feature, as well as an explanation, of the Macedonian-Greek commercial exploitation of Southwestern Asia, Egypt, and the Eastern Mediterranean lands in the third pre-Christian century that a fairly complete control of shipbuilding facilities in that area then lay in the hands of the Macedonians and the Greeks.

To the evidences already suggested of the business superiority of the Greek people in the period preceding Alexander's conquest one may now add the technical development of harbor construction. A recent German study, based primarily on archaeological evidence, has brought proof that the type of harbor enclosed within the city wall is specifically a Greek development<sup>19</sup>. The changes of the pre-Alexandrian period had been toward the construction of moles which could serve as fortifications as well as for protection of shipping from heavy seas, and toward the construction of connected artificial double harbors. It was a harbor fortified and otherwise constructed after Greek models which helped the Syrians defy Alexander for so long in Tyre; the harbor of Sidon, and that of Carthage as well, were built on the Greek system<sup>20</sup>.

There is no doubt that Greek engineers in the days of Philip and Alexander held the highest place in their profession, both in the theory of engineering and in its practical applications. A high degree of specialization is not to be assumed in the engineering field except in the sense that certain engineers became particularly famous in some one branch of the profession. The general term for an engineer was still, and so remained, *architecton*, or master-builder. Archytas, philosopher and statesman of Tarentum, friend and associate of Plato, was regarded in antiquity as the founder of the science of mechanics. Hippodamus of Miletus laid out the streets of the Peiraeus in the time of Pericles. Though Hippodamus developed in that and similar undertakings the type of city-plan which dominated the ancient world for centuries<sup>21</sup>, he also bears only the general appellation of *architecton*. The city-plans of numerous colonies established by Alexander and his successors are based ultimately upon his system, as is demonstrable in the cases of Alexandria and Priene<sup>22</sup>. Dinocrates of Macedon, who made the measurements for the city of Alexandria, was likewise an *architecton*, and was likewise working on the system devised by Hippodamus. In engineering practice there are, indeed, indications of a small degree of specialization. Alexander assigned the work of cleaning out the underground outlets of Lake Copais to Crates of Chalcis, who is called a *metalleutes* or miner<sup>23</sup>. It is very doubtful that the sinking of the ventilation shafts, the deepest of which was two hundred and sixteen feet, and the original plan of the work can be ascribed to Crates. But the work assigned to him was an am-

<sup>14</sup>G. F. Hill, *Handbook of Greek and Roman Coins*, 84, and note 2 (London, 1899).

<sup>15</sup>See B. Laum's corrections, in *Philologische Wochenschrift* 42 (1922), 427-432, of the conclusions drawn by J. Hasebroek in *Hermes* 55 (1920), 113-173. See also Laum's article in *Conrad's Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, 2, 166-167.

<sup>16</sup>Kurt Riezler, *Ueber Finanzen und Monopole im Alten Griechenland*, 50-51.

<sup>17</sup>*Politics* 1259 a 20.

<sup>18</sup>See Julius Beloch, *Geschichte Griechenlands*, III, 1, 460-461, for the technical advance in battleship construction.

<sup>19</sup>Karl Lehmann-Hartleben, *Die Antiken Hafenanlagen*, Klio, Beiheft 14.65 (Leipzig, 1923).

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, 93.

<sup>21</sup>H. Erdmann, *Hippodamus von Milet*, *Philologus* 49, 193-194.

<sup>22</sup>Pauly-Wissowa, 8, 1733.

<sup>23</sup>See Strabo 9.407.



bitious drainage project, involving to a high degree both empirical and scientific knowledge.

With great advantages, based upon superiority in business skill, technical knowledge, and mental habits of inquiry and experimentation, the Macedonians and the Greeks penetrated Western Asia and Egypt along the route of Alexander's march. What might be accomplished in the field of business enterprise with such equipment when that equipment was combined with absolute power was soon shown in the wheat manipulations of Cleomenes of Naucratis, so-called 'Satrap of Egypt', by appointment of Alexander himself<sup>24</sup>. As financial governor he turned to account his complete control of the grain rents and the taxes, in the following manner. In Greece a dearth of grain existed. Cleomenes forbade the export of grain from Egypt, thereby driving up prices in the cities of Greece and lowering them in Egypt. By virtue of his official position Cleomenes himself was not affected by the decree forbidding export, while the competition of the independent exporters was eliminated. Cleomenes bought up the Egyptian grain at the market price. He established a system of private communication through his agents by which knowledge of a fall in price in any given place came to them quickly. In such cases the laden ships would be diverted from those cities to which they had been originally consigned and would be sent to other localities where the price remained high.

With superiority in enterprise and in business organization the Macedonians and the Greeks flocked into Egypt in the reigns of the first two Ptolemies. They were made welcome and given every opportunity of service, in the army as mercenary soldiers, in the bureaucratic service in all manner of positions, from the highest offices to the head clerkships of the central administration. These two rulers, Ptolemy Soter and Ptolemy Philadelphus, ruled Egypt for three-quarters of a century. The first Ptolemy gives every indication of having been a man characterized by energy combined with an outstanding prudence and sense of realities. He was never tempted by the dream of Antigonos the One-Eyed to control in his single hand the great empire of the dead Alexander. At Alexander's death it was he who counselled straightway the division of the Empire among Alexander's generals<sup>25</sup>. It is probably to his thoroughgoing realism and common sense that we should ascribe the initiation of the economic and political policies which mark the course of the early Ptolemaic régime in Egypt.

Through the recovery of important papyri of the middle of the third century B. C. we are in a position to follow in considerable detail the methods and the plans of the second Ptolemy, and of the Greeks of all

degrees who assisted him in the process of making the most of the advantages which Egypt offered them. Two outstanding sources of knowledge are the Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus and the fortunate recovery of the archives of a Greek fortune-hunter named Zenon, who hailed from Caunus in Caria<sup>26</sup>.

Zenon went into the service of Apollonius, the Dioecetes of Egypt, remaining with this powerful man for fifteen years, from 261 to 246 B. C., at first as a courtier in his retinue. From the year 257-256 onward he was engaged with affairs on a large estate in the Fayum which was held by Apollonius as gift land from King Ptolemy. Zenon's service was that of general manager in charge of the development and organization of this great farm, which was newly reclaimed land<sup>27</sup>. From 246 to 238 B. C., after the death of Ptolemy II and the disappearance of Apollonius, Zenon still appears as a prosperous man engaged in large affairs of his own in the Fayum. In the Zenon correspondence we see an amazing number of Greeks who revolve about the central figure of Apollonius, all engaged in a complicated round of business activities. It is difficult to separate their activities, official, semi-official, and private, one from the other. These Greeks were not producers. They were managers of official departments, exploiters of the wealth of Egypt and of the labor of its people, whether as officials or lining their own nests. One of the more recent letters published by Edgar indicates how these Greeks followed one another into the Arsinoite Nome (the Fayum), as into a land of golden opportunity. There was no fixed immigration quota to bar anybody.

Plato to Zenon greeting. The bearer of this letter to you is Demetrius. It seems that his father happens to be making his living in the Arsinoite Nome. The lad therefore wishes also to get some employment there; and as he has heard that you were a kindly man, some of his friends have asked me to write to you regarding him in order that you may appoint him somewhere in your district. Please therefore do me this favor and see that he gets something to do, whatever you may judge him fitted for; and look after him otherwise if he is useful to you<sup>28</sup>.

This lad Demetrius did not begin at the bottom, as do the Demetriuses who come to us, and work upward. He started near the top. It is worth noting that the approach of this lad to Zenon was through a man who knew neither Demetrius himself nor his father. It was through friends who knew Plato, who in turn stood in close business relations with Zenon, that he obtained his recommendation.

(To be Concluded)

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

W. L. WESTERMANN

<sup>24</sup>The sources are Pseudo-Aristotle, *Oeconomica*; Demosthenes, *Against Dionysodorus*; and the Athenian decrees in honor of Heraclides of Salamis (see Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, 1.304). The situation is summed up by Kurt Riezler, *Ueber Finanzen und Monopole*, etc., 33-34.

<sup>25</sup>It may also be true, as alleged by Q. Curtius Rufus 10.6.15, that he advocated a federation of the rulers of the separate territorial parts in the form of a Council which should decide upon matters of common interest, with the power to make binding decisions.

<sup>26</sup>Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus, edited by Bernard P. Grenfell (Oxford, 1896). The Zenon letters are widely scattered; but the greatest number of them have been published by C. C. Edgar, in the *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte*, XVIII-XXIV (Cairo, 1919-1924; cited as P. Cairo Edgar), and in the *Papiri Greci e Latini*, Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana, IV-VII (Florence, 1917-1925).

<sup>27</sup>M. Rostovtzeff, *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B. C.: A Study in Economic History*, 39-41 (Madison, Wisconsin, 1922; see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.110-112).

<sup>28</sup>P. Cairo Edgar, No. 102. Compare No. 82, a letter of introduction from Amyntas to Zenon, given to a young man named Zopyrus who hailed from Zenon's native city, Caunus, in Caria.



## REVIEWS

Studies in Herodotus. By Joseph Wells. Oxford: Basil Blackwell (1923). Pp. viii + 232. 7 sh., 6 d.

The author of the book entitled *Studies in Herodotus* is best known as joint editor, with W. W. How, of *Herodotus* (2 volumes, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912). The present volume consists of eleven papers, five of which are entirely new. Two others are reprinted from the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. Most of the papers have been read before learned societies, and all have been recently revised. Mr. Wells is Warden of Wadham College, Oxford, and has been for many years a teacher of ancient history. Doubtless his experience, both as a teacher and as a student, of the constantly shifting points of view of scholars in regard to disputed matters in history has led him to be a moderate conservative. He prefers to follow Herodotus and early authorities rather than to accept the oftentimes fuller and more alluring statements of writers of later antiquity. Mr. Wells himself says of his papers (Preface, V), "...So far as they have any definite point of view, it is to emphasize the importance of tradition, and the danger of rewriting (on a priori theories) the evidence we possess..."

In the first paper, *The Account of the Colonization of Ionia in Herodotus (1-18)*, the author holds that Herodotus is right in his view that the Ionians came into Asia Minor from European Greece, and in connecting them especially with Attica.

In the second paper (19-26), Mr. Wells answers the question *Who was Gyges?*, by conjecturing that he was a Cimmerian invader who intermarried with the royal family of Lydia, and for a time raised that kingdom to a position where it became a menace to the Greeks of Asia Minor. When the dynasty founded by Gyges died out, Lydia sank back to her former unimportance.

In a long paper entitled *Peloponnesian History to 550 B. C. (27-54)*, followed by four Appendices<sup>1</sup>, the author discusses various points in the field of the earliest authentic Greek history. Archaeology, says he (39), "...shows us that Sparta, till the end of the seventh century B. C., had pursued the ordinary course of Greek development, and had been a flourishing centre of art and trade, but that in the sixth century the change had begun which, by the end of that century, had made Sparta a barrack, and her citizens an exclusive band of trained warriors". The author suggests that this change may have been brought about through the influence of dissension at home and during the stress of a life and death struggle with the tyrants of Corinth. The real law-giver at this crisis may have been the Ephor Chilon, though, for the purpose of lending religious sanctity to the changes made, they may have been referred to a mythical law-giver, Lycurgus, whose name is connected with the worship of Zeus Lycaeus.

The next paper, *Some Points as to the Chronology*

of the Reign of Cleomenes I (74-94), was published in *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 25 (1905).

In a paper on *The Persian Friends of Herodotus (95-111)*, Mr. Wells discusses in particular a certain Zopyrus, mentioned in Herodotus 3.160, where it is stated that he went over to Athens as a deserter from the Persians. He was the son of Megabyzus, one of Xerxes's six generals in chief against Greece. It is not improbable that he and Herodotus, both of whom had once been Persian subjects, met at Athens. In that case the historian may have derived from him much of his information in regard to matters relating to Persia.

In a sixth paper, entitled *Miltiades, Son of Cimon (till the time of Marathon)* Mr. Wells pictures (112-124) the hero of Marathon as having been a sort of Greek *condottiere* in the decade before the Ionic Revolt. He defends, too, the historical truth of Herodotus's story of the debate at the Ister Bridge. In discussing the early life of Cimon among the northern barbarians, the author calls attention to a red-figured *pinax* in the Ashmolean Museum bearing the portrait of a handsome young warrior in Scythian dress, with the inscription *Καλὸς Μιλτιάδης*.

A companion study to the foregoing is *Cimon, the Son of Miltiades (125-144)*. Themistocles, says Mr. Wells, conceived the idea of the Athenian *ἀρχή*; Aristides furnished the moral force; but "...it was the military genius and the diplomacy of Cimon which used the material and moral forces provided by Themistocles and Aristides, and which won the conquests which Pericles organised only too thoroughly" (125-126). The crowning achievement of Cimon was the double victory at the Eurymedon. Concerning this Mr. Wells says (137), "...it is all important to notice the daring resolution with which Cimon led his men, already weary from their victory over the fleet... to attack the enemy on land.... There is a real Nelson touch in the desperate courage which would be satisfied with nothing but an annihilating victory..."

In the next paper, *Recent Criticism on the Persian Wars (145-168)*, Mr. Wells attacks the theories of the German scholars Delbrück and Obst, and even takes a thrust at Professor Bury for his theory of the military evolutions at the battle of Plataea. On page 161 he says: "...judged by the ordinary rules of evidence, the narrative of Grote, who follows Herodotus implicitly... can still claim to be the best account of the great battle..."

The papers considered so far may be said to have been written primarily for the specialist in Greek history. The three which follow, and conclude the series, have interest for the student of literature as well. In the first of these, *Aristophanes and Herodotus (169-182)*, Mr. Wells indicates that the parodies of Herodotus in Aristophanes are almost entirely confined to two plays, the *Acharnians* and the *Birds*. At the time when the *Acharnians* was brought out (February, 425 B. C.), negotiations with the Great King were perhaps going on, or had recently been concluded; hence jokes on Persian customs, like that of serving up whole roasted oxen (mentioned in Herodotus 1.133),

<sup>1</sup>These are I. The Chronology of Pheidon (54-62); II. The Date of the Messenian Wars (62-66); III. The Settlement of Thera (66-70); IV. Some Notes on the Cypselidae (70-73).

were appropriate subjects for ridicule, as in *Acharnians* 85-87. The court officer called 'The King's Eye' (Herodotus 1.114) is made the subject of a jest in *Acharnians* 92. It is commonly supposed that Herodotus returned to Athens about the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. The above allusions show that his work must have been so well known that it could be effectively parodied shortly after that time. In the case of the *Birds* there seems to be a very definite allusion in 1127-1129 to the description, in Herodotus 1.179, of the walls of Babylon. This and other allusions lead Mr. Wells to say (179) that "...Herodotus was looked upon as a good subject for a joke in 414 B. C. ..." Mr. Wells adds (180), "It then may be suggested that Herodotus published Book II, shortly before the appearance of the *Birds* in 414, and so gave Aristophanes occasion for a fresh burst of jokes".

Another paper deals with Herodotus and the Intellectual Life of his Age (183-204). Contrary to the opinion of Meyer and Jacoby that Herodotus was led at Athens, when the great decisive struggle with Sparta began, to abandon his original idea of writing a *Ges. Periodos*, like that of Hecataeus, and to combine the results of all his special researches into one work, Mr. Wells holds that the influences which moulded Herodotus were mainly non-Athenian. "... he is the crown", says the author (184), "of the intellectual greatness of the Asiatic-Greek sea-board, driven by Persian conquest into exile, and developed in new fields and on new lines by the enterprising life of the Greek world in the West". While the historian is familiar with the developed thought of the fifth century, he hardly ever accepts it. He is not a member of the Periclean circle; he is a sixth century Greek, with the interests of an Ionic philosopher, not of an Athenian sophist. Doubtless Herodotus and Sophocles were friends. With *Antigone* 904 compare Herodotus 3.119 (the preference of a brother to all other relatives); with *Electra* 62-64 compare Herodotus 4.95 (return to life after pretended death); and with *Oedipus Coloneus* 337-341 compare Herodotus 2.35 (the topsyturveness of Egypt). But in all these cases the probability is that Sophocles borrowed from Herodotus; the historian is the giver, not the taker. "...Herodotus does not quote from Athenian contemporary literature, as he quotes from that of earlier generations.... <In literature and in art> it is pre-Periclean work that fills his mind" (188). On the other hand there is a close correspondence between Herodotus 3.108 and Plato, *Protagoras* 321 B (on the fecundity of the weaker animals and the paucity of offspring in those who prey on them). Of this Mr. Wells says (193), "As Herodotus and Protagoras both took part in the colonisation of Thuri, it is most probable that this resemblance is due to their actual intercourse..."

The final paper is entitled *Herodotus in English Literature* (205-228). Spenser, Milton, Butler, Dryden, Pope, Wordsworth, Byron, Browning, and many others have been indebted in greater or less degree to the *Father of History*. In closing Mr. Wells quotes the following from Andrew Lang:

Far travelled coaster of the Midland seas!  
What marvels did those curious eyes behold—  
Winged snakes, and carven labyrinths of old,  
The emerald column raised to Hercules.

Every teacher of ancient history should be grateful to Mr. Wells for this series of essays. While it is not to be expected that all will agree in a field where so many matters are in dispute, all will appreciate the thorough scholarship and sound judgment which pervade this work.

MIAMI UNIVERSITY,  
OXFORD, OHIO

FRANK L. CLARK

The Religious Thought of the Greeks from Homer to The Triumph of Christianity. By Clifford Herschel Moore. Second Edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press (1925). Pp. vii + 385. \$4.00.

For the second edition of his important book, *The Religious Thought of the Greeks from Homer to the Triumph of Christianity*, Professor C. H. Moore writes the following Prefatory Note:

In preparing the second edition I have thought it wise to make no important change in the character of the book. I have therefore contented myself with correcting errors and modifying a few statements.

The first edition, published in 1916, was reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 10.214, by Professor W. S. Fox. In a review in *Classical Philology* 13 (1918), 99-103, Professor Ivan M. Linforth pointed out some matters of which cognizance might well have been taken in the preparation of the second edition. For a very favorable notice, by an English scholar, W. R. Halliday, of the book in its new form see *The Classical Review* 39.183 (November-December, 1925).

CHARLES KNAPP

#### A FURTHER NOTE ON THE USE OF SAND AS A BLOTTER

The methods employed in drying ink are of great interest, and so I was glad to read Mr. Shewan's note, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 19. 230, on the use, in India, of sand and iron filings instead of blotting paper, a note called forth by Professor Knapp's remarks, in 19.158, on the use of sand, in modern Italy, and, some decades ago, in America, in like case.

I myself have observed in India, as recently as 1918, sand being used as a blotter by the public letter-writers in the Punjab bazaars. I also recall the use of sand in the same connection in a tiny Italian village, and my wife tells me that, as a child in the Orient, she often saw Arabs drying writing in the same way. Further, I have a feeling that, in my reading, I actually came across a reference to this matter. It seemed to me that the passage was in Apuleius, but search for it has proved vain. If the all-embracing Pliny makes no mention of this use of sand, I should think that an actual reference to it would be more elusive than the *ignis fatuus*.

SEWARD PARK HIGH SCHOOL,  
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK

HENRY E. WEDECK